

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-290V

Filed: August 2, 2021

UNPUBLISHED

USMAN AMIN,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Special Master Daniel Horner

Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (flu); Shoulder
Injury Related to Vaccine
Administration (SIRVA)

Leah VaSahnja Durant, Law Offices of Leah V. Durant, PLLC, Washington, DC, for petitioner.

Kyle Edward Pozza, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On March 16, 2020, Usman Amin (“petitioner”) filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that he suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (“SIRVA”) as a result of his October 31, 2018 influenza (“flu”) vaccination. (ECF No. 1, p. 1.)

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On July 26, 2021, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. (ECF No. 25.)

Specifically, Respondent states that:

[P]etitioner had no apparent history of pain, inflammation, or dysfunction of the affected shoulder prior to intramuscular vaccine administration that would explain the alleged signs, symptoms, examination findings, and/or diagnostic studies occurring after vaccine injection; he more likely than not suffered the onset of pain within forty-eight hours of vaccine administration; his pain and reduced range of motion were limited to the shoulder in which the intramuscular vaccine was administered; and there is no other condition or abnormality present that would explain petitioner's symptoms.

Id. at 4. Respondent further agrees that “the records show that the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that petitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of his injury for more than six months after vaccine administration.” *Id.* at 4 (citations omitted).

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Daniel T. Horner
Daniel T. Horner
Special Master